



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/704,569	11/03/2000	Herman Rodriguez	AUS9-2000-0488-US1	2337

7590 09/17/2004

Joseph T Van Leeuwen
P O Box 81641
Austin, TX 78708-1641

EXAMINER

ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3623

DATE MAILED: 09/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/704,569

Applicant(s)

RODRIGUEZ ET AL.

Examiner

Akiba K Robinson-Boyce

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,14,15,18,20-23,25,27,28,30-33,35 and 37-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,14,15,18,20-23,25,27,28,30-33,35 and 37-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Due to communications filed 8/10/04, the following is a non-final office action. Claims 1, 3, 4, 5-7, 10, 14, 18, 20, 21, 22, 25, 27, 28, 30-32, 35, 37 have been amended, claims 2, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 24, 26, 29, 34 and 36 have been cancelled, and claims 38-40 have been added in a previous amendment filed 4/5/04. No changes have been made to the claims in the amendment filed 8/10/04. Claims 1, 3-10, 14, 15, 18, 20-23, 25, 27, 28, 30-33, 35, and 37-40 are pending in this application and have been examined on the merits. The previous rejection has been withdrawn and the following rejection reflects the claims as amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3, 18, 20, 27, 28, 30, 37, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tognazzini (US 5,790,974) as cited by applicant, and further in view of Paredes (US 5,973,619).

As per claims 1, 28, Tognazzini discloses:

Art Unit: 3623

Scheduling the travel arrangements using a computer system, (col. 8, lines 25-27, [inputs by a user]);

recording the scheduled travel arrangements on a nonvolatile storage device connected to the computer system, (col. 8, lines 28-30, (entries entered into calendar memory)).;

Tognazzini fails to disclose sending one or more automated requests corresponding to the travel arrangements from the computer system to one or more service agents, wherein at least one of the service agents are selected from the group consisting of a delivery service agent, a telephone system, an electronic calendar system, and a medical information system, but does disclose a user beginning a personal calendar process by typing in entries into an electronic calendar system in Col. 8, lines 23-46.

However, Paredes discloses:

sending one or more automated requests corresponding to the travel arrangements from the computer system to one or more service agents, wherein at least one of the service agents are selected from the group consisting of a delivery service agent, a telephone system, an electronic calendar system, and a medical information system, (col. 5, lines 48-53, [shows an automated vehicular requesting service where a request is sent to a corresponding dispatching service]). Paredes discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that request for services can be automated.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to send one or more automated requests corresponding

Art Unit: 3623

to the travel arrangements from the computer system to one or more service agents, wherein at least one of the service agents are selected from the group consisting of a delivery service agent, a telephone system, an electronic calendar system, and a medical information system with the motivation of showing that electronic calendar systems can be used to handle travel arrangements.

As per claim 3, 20, 30, Tognazzini discloses:

sending includes one of sending an automatic email message, sending an automatic facsimile, and sending an automatic data stream using a predefined protocol, (Col. 12, lines 17-19, and line 22, [user message {e-mail message}], ab, lines 10-12, [shows system is implemented automatically], w/ Col. 9, lines 56-62, [calendar memory updated according to predetermined protocol]).

As per claim 18, Tognazzini discloses:

one or more processors, (Col. 8, lines 39-40, [internal processor]);
a memory accessible by the processors, (Col. 8, lines 37-39, [calendar memory]);
a nonvolatile storage device accessible by the processors, (col. 5, lines 11-12, [nonvolatile memory]); and
a travel automation tool, the travel automation tool including:
means for scheduling travel arrangements using a computer system, (Col. 8, lines 25-27, [element for calculating]);
means for recording the scheduled travel arrangements on the nonvolatile storage device, (col. 8, lines 31-32, [entering into calendar memory]); and

Art Unit: 3623

means for sending one or more automated requests from the information handling system to one or more service agents, (col. 8, lines 36-38, [agent receives downloaded information], ab, lines 10-12, [automatically updating information]).

As per claims 27, 37, Tognazzini discloses:

means for receiving the automated request at a second information handling system, (Col. 3, lines 15-16, [second agent]);

means for searching a database connected to the second information handling system for requested information, (Col. 3, lines 15-16, [receiving location data]);

means for downloading destination related medical information resulting from the searching to a computing device that is accessible by a user, (Col. 5, lines 18-20, [downloading database information]), w/ col. 7, lines 45-51, [transmitting location information to calendar system]).

As per claims 25, 35, Tognazzini fails to disclose receiving the automated request at the electronic calendar system, but does disclose a service agent making arrangements for scheduled events in Col. 15, lines 38-45.

However Paredes discloses:

receiving the automated request at the electronic calendar system, (Col. 5, lines 48-53, [shows request is being sent via on-line transmission media to a corresponding dispatching service, it is therefore inherent for the request to be received by the dispatching service]); and

Art Unit: 3623

updating an electronic calendar maintained by the electronic calendar system with information related to the travel arrangements, (Col. 6, lines 32-35, [shows that the computer system displays the fare and types of payment options according to selected destinations, therefore, the system is updated with fare and payment options related to selected destinations). Paredes discloses these limitations for the purpose showing that the travel system can be updated accordingly.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to receive an automated request and to update the electronic calendar with information with the motivation of maintaining a current calendar environment with the most up-to-date travel events.

4. Claims 4-10, 21-23, 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tognazzini (US 5,790,974), as cited by applicant, and further in view of Paredes (US 5,973,619), and further in view of Levine (US 6,076,121), as cited by applicant.

As per claims 4, 21, 31, both Tognazzini and Paredes fail to disclose wherein the delivery service agents include one or more parcel services, and wherein the automated requests include one of holding packages for customer pickup, delivering packages on a future date, and leaving packages with a neighbor, but Tognazzini does disclose a service agent in Col. 15, lines 38-45.

However, Levine discloses:

Art Unit: 3623

wherein the delivery service agents include one or more parcel services, and wherein the automated requests include one of holding packages for customer pickup, delivering packages on a future date, and leaving packages with a neighbor, (col. 2, lines 8-14, [mail or parcel system, where holding packages for customer pickup, delivering packages on a future date and leaving packages with a neighbor are obvious with the system since the system is directed towards a postal business and these types of requests are common and standard in postal operations])). Levine discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that a parcel service can be incorporated into a delivery service agent system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for an automated request to include one of holding packages for customer pickup, delivering packages on a future date, and leaving packages with a neighbor with the motivation of getting the package to the owner in a reasonable amount of time.

As per claim 5, both Tognazzini and Paredes fail to disclose wherein the delivery services include a post office, and wherein the automated holding mail for on a future date address requests include at least one of customer pickup, delivering mail and forwarding mail to another, but Tognazzini does disclose a delivery service for travel arrangements in col. 15, lines 38-45.

However Levine discloses:

Art Unit: 3623

wherein the delivery services include a post office, and wherein the automated holding mail for on a future date address requests include at least one of customer pickup, delivering mail and forwarding mail to another, (Col. 2, lines 14-17, [post office and parcel handling offices, where customer pickup, delivering and forwarding mail are obvious with the system since the system is directed towards a postal business and these types of requests are common and standard in postal operations])). Levine discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that post office services can be incorporated into a delivery service agent system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for an automated request to include customer pickup, delivering and forwarding mail with the motivation of getting the package to the owner in a reasonable amount of time.

As per claim 5, both Tognazzini and Paredes fail to disclose wherein the delivery services includes a company mailroom, and wherein the automated requests include at least one of holding mail for future pickup, delivering mail on a future date, and forwarding mail to another address, but Tognazzini does disclose a delivery service for travel arrangements in col. 15, lines 38-45.

However Levine discloses:

wherein the delivery services includes a company mailroom, and wherein the automated requests include at least one of holding mail for future pickup, delivering mail on a future date, and forwarding mail to another address, (Col. 2, line 28, [shows sorting which occurs in a mailroom, where holding mail for

Art Unit: 3623

future pickup, delivering mail on a future date and forwarding mail to another address are obvious with the system since the system is directed towards a postal business and these types of requests are common and standard in postal operations. Levine discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that post office services can be incorporated into a delivery service agent system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for an automated request to include holding mail for future pickup, delivering mail on a future date and forwarding mail to another address with the motivation of getting the package to the owner in a reasonable amount of time.

As per claims 7, 22, 32, both Tognazzini and Paredes fail to disclose wherein the service agents include one or more of the telephone systems and wherein the sending automated requests include configuring instructions corresponding to a telephone, but Tognazzini does disclose a delivery service for travel arrangements in col. 15, lines 38-45.

However Levine discloses:

wherein the service agents include one or more telephone systems and wherein the sending automated requests include configuring instructions corresponding to a telephone, (Col. 8, lines 45-47, [telephone network], Col. 12, lines 20-35, [assigning FP code represents configuring]). Levine discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that telephone services can be incorporated into a delivery service agent system.

Art Unit: 3623

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to include configuring instructions corresponding to a telephone with the motivation of properly guiding the user for telephone operation.

As per claim 8, both Tognazzini and Paredes fail to disclose wherein the configuring requests include at least one of changing a voicemail greeting, forwarding calls received at a first phone number to a second phone number, transferring a caller to an alternate phone number, and providing the caller with an emergency contact, but Tognazzini does disclose a delivery service for travel arrangements in col. 15, lines 38-45.

However Levine discloses:

wherein the configuring requests include at least one of changing a voicemail greeting, forwarding calls received at a first phone number to a second phone number, transferring a caller to an alternate phone number, and providing the caller with an emergency contact, (Col. 22, lines 37-43, [call forwarding]). Levine discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that telephone services can be incorporated into a delivery service agent system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to include call forwarding in the configuring request with the motivation of guaranteeing a successful telephone connection.

As per claims 9, 23, 33, both Tognazzini and Paredes fail to disclose registering the telephone with an email system prior to the configuring, wherein

Art Unit: 3623

the registering includes sending a message to the email system, but Tognazzini does disclose an email system in col. 12, lines 17-22.

However Levine discloses:

registering the telephone with an email system prior to the configuring, wherein the registering includes sending a message to the email system, (Col. 1, lines 32-40, [voice signals being carried to the Internet server], col.2 , lines 51-61, [shows e-mail message]). Levine discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that telephone and email services can be incorporated into a delivery service agent system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to register the telephone with an email system prior to the configuring with the motivation of guaranteeing another contact means.

As per claim 10, both Tognazzini and Paredes fail to disclose setting a backup contact name, wherein the backup contact name corresponds with an alternate phone number, and receiving a predefined signal from a calling telephone requesting the transferring to the alternate phone number, but Tognazzini does disclose a delivery service for travel arrangements in col. 15, lines 38-45.

However Levine discloses:

setting a backup contact name, wherein the backup contact name corresponds with the alternate phone number, and receiving a predefined signal from a calling telephone requesting the transferring to the alternate phone number, (col. 22, lines 13-25, [translated pseudo-number connection to a

Art Unit: 3623

temporary intermediate destination/different destination due to signals]. Levine discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that a signal can be responsible for connections to certain destinations]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to set a backup contact name, wherein the backup contact name corresponds with the alternate phone number, and receive a predefined signal from a calling telephone requesting the transferring to the alternate phone number with the motivation of guaranteeing a telephone connection with an available person.

5. Claims 14,15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tognazzini (US 5,790,974), as cited by applicant, and further in view of Paredes (US 5,973,619), and further in view of Berman et al (US 5,995,939).

As per claim 14, both Tognazzini and Paredes fail to disclose receiving the automated request at the medical information system, and downloading destination related medical information to a computing device that is accessible by a user in response to the received request, but Tognazzini does disclose a user beginning a personal calendar process by typing in entries into an electronic calendar system in Col. 8, lines 23-46.

However Berman et al discloses:

receiving the automated request at the medical information system, (Col. 3, lines 64-67, [crate/send service message]);

and downloading destination related medical information to a computing device that is accessible by a user in response to the received request, (Col. 12, lines 24-35, [retrieving e-mail addresses for sponsoring systems]). Berman et al discloses these limitations in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that a medical information system can be incorporated into a travel arrangement system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to receive an automated request and download destination related medical information to a computing device with the motivation of properly delivering medical data to a device that is easily accessible by a user.

As per claim 15, both Tognazzini and Paredes fail to disclose wherein the medical information corresponds with one or more medical services offered at a travel destination, but Tognazzini does disclose an electronic calendar system for making travel arrangements in Col. 8, lines 23-46.

However Berman et al discloses:

wherein the medical information corresponds with one or more medical services offered at a travel destination, (Col. 2, line 26-31, [correspondence between the office and the testing lab]). Berman et al discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that medical information can be incorporated into a travel arrangement system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for the medical information to correspond with one or more medical service offered at a travel destination with the motivation of

Art Unit: 3623

providing means for a user to acquire medical treatment in a reasonable amount of time.

6. Claims 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tognazzini (US 5,790,974) as cited by applicant, and further in view of Paredes (US5,973,619), and further in view of Felger (6,553,108).

As per claims 38-40, neither Tognazzini nor Paredes disclose wherein one of the automated requests results in increasing an user's electronic wallet balance and decreasing a user's bank account balance, the user corresponding to the travel arrangements, but Tognazzini does disclose a personal calendaring system for making travel arrangements in the Abstract, lines 1-24.

However, Felger discloses:

wherein one of the automated requests results in increasing an user's electronic wallet balance and decreasing a user's bank account balance, the user corresponding to the travel arrangements, (Abstract, lines 1-32, [request received from user and information associated with a credit account requested, and charging the user's credit account, w/ Col. 13, lines 61-66, [where the credit account is shown to be an e-wallet to pay a fee. In this case, since the credit account is shown to be an e-wallet, it is obvious that when a fee is presented, the user's bank account, which is associated with the e-wallet is decreased, therefore causing an increase of the same amount in the e-wallet account]]).

Felger discloses this limitation in an analogous art for the purpose of showing that electronic wallets are used to pay fees for value added services.

Art Unit: 3623

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for one of the automated requests to result in increasing an user's electronic wallet balance and decreasing a user's bank account balance, the user corresponding to the travel arrangements with the motivation of showing that electronic wallets can be used in handling travel arrangements.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments, see pages 13-15, filed 8/10/04, with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claims 1, 3-10, 14, 15, 18, 20-23, 25, 27, 28, 30-33, 35, and 37-40 has been withdrawn, and a new ground(s) of rejection has been presented.

The applicant lists claim 12 as currently pending in this application, however, in the amendment filed 4/5/04, claim 12 was cancelled. The examiner has therefore not considered claim 12 in the rejection.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Akiba K Robinson-Boyce whose telephone number is 703-305-1340. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30am-5pm.


Art Unit: 3623

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 703-305-9643. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7238 [After final communications, labeled "Box AF"], 703-746-7239 [Official Communications], and 703-746-7150 [Informal/Draft Communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"].

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



A. R. B.
September 8, 2004



TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600